



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,080	09/26/2003	Jaakko Rajaniemi	NOKI.003PA	7486
7590 Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC Suite 125 8009 34th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55425			EXAMINER DAFTUAR, SAKET K	
			ART UNIT 2151	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/673,080

**Applicant(s)**

RAJANIEMI, JAAKKO

**Examiner**

SAKET K. DAFTUAR

**Art Unit**

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/02/08.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. This office action is responsive to the amendment filed on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008. Claims 1-33 are presented for the further examination.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments see Remarks, filed June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008, with respect to Perttila reference issued in previous Final office action have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, Final office action Issued on March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008 has been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim1-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Maes U.S. Patent Number 6,934,756 B2 (hereinafter Maes) and Kumar et al. US Patent Number 6,965, 929 B2 (hereinafter Kumar).

As per claim 1, Maes discloses forming a Web service message [Distributed speech recognition message over a web service, column 43, lines 15-64; Figures 17, 20] at a first network entity, the Web service message targeted for a mobile terminal [Figures 17, 19-20]; directing a request via the

Internet to a locator arrangement [controller, see figure 16] to assist in processing the Web service message [process the speech I/O which are remotely connected over the network; see column 28, line 29 – column 29, line 2], wherein the locator arrangement is capable of identifying and locating mobile devices (see column 28, line 29 - column 29, line 2); sending the Web service message to the mobile terminal utilizing the locator arrangement, the Web service message sent [the stream is sent to a speech server and process the browser data back to and from the server; see column 26, lines 33-67] to the mobile terminal using a mobile services transport protocol [mobile devices, block 1902; Figures 17 , 19-20]; and processing the Web service message at the mobile terminal [see Figure 17; column 29, line 29 – column 31, line 19].

However, Maes is silent about the mobile terminal as not being an internet addressable.

Kumar teaches that mobile terminal is not Internet addressable (see column2, line 60 - column 3 line 47)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Kumar and Maes to provide a secure and enhanced communication between mobile terminals, terminal devices that are not internet addressable and to provide communication to the terminals that are outside the current local area network located remotely on second network or behind the private network gateway device.

As per claim 2, Maes discloses the Web service message includes a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) message (see column 4, lines 3-42, and column 53, lines 1-54).

As per claim 3, Maes discloses the mobile services transport protocol comprises a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) (see column 4, lines 3-42, column 53, and lines 1-54).

As per claim 4, Maes discloses the mobile services transport protocol comprises a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) (see column 4, lines 3-42, column 53, and lines 1-54).

As per claim 5, Maes discloses the mobile services transport protocol comprises a Simple Mail Transport Protocol (SMTP) (see column 4, lines 3-42, column 53, and lines 1-54).

As per claim 6, Maes discloses registering a web service of the mobile terminal with the locator arrangement (see column 13, line 63 – column 14, line 25).

As per claim 7, Maes discloses sending the Web service message to the mobile terminal utilizing the locator arrangement comprises determining an address [registering conversational state; see column 11, lines 34-61] of the mobile terminal based the registration of the mobile terminal with the locator arrangement

As per claim 8, Maes discloses sending the Web service message to the mobile terminal utilizing the locator arrangement comprises determining an

address of the mobile terminal based [registering conversational state; see column 11, lines 34-61] on an identifier of the mobile terminal included in the Web service message (see column 26, lines 33-67).

As per claim 9, Maes discloses sending the Web service message to the mobile terminal utilizing the locator arrangement comprises determining an address of the mobile terminal based [registering conversational state; see column 11, lines 34-61] on a Universal Resource Identifier (URI) associated with the locator arrangement (see column 26, lines 33-67).

As per claim 10, Maes discloses directing the request to the locator arrangement for processing the Web service message comprises directing the Web service message to the locator arrangement, and wherein sending the Web service message [the stream is sent to a speech server and process the browser data back to and from the serve; see column 26, lines 33-67] to the mobile terminal [mobile devices, block 1902; Figures 17, 19-20] utilizing the locator arrangement comprises sending (see column 26, lines 33-67) the Web service message via the locator arrangement to the locator terminal (see column 26, lines 33-67).

As per claim 11, Maes discloses sending the Web service message via the locator arrangement to the mobile terminal comprises initiating a session between the locator arrangement and the mobile terminal using a Wireless Application Protocol Over The Air Push (see paragraph 0061).

As per claim 12, Maes discloses directing the request to the locator arrangement for processing the Web service [process the speech I/O which are remotely connected over the network; see column 28, line 29 – column 29, line 2] message comprises requesting an address of the mobile terminal from the locator arrangement, and wherein sending the Web service message [the stream is sent to a speech server and process the browser data back to and from the serve; see column 26, lines 33-67] to the mobile terminal utilizing the locator arrangement comprises sending the Web service message to the mobile terminal [mobile devices, block 1902; Figures 17 , 19-20] using the address of the mobile terminal provided from the locator arrangement (see column 26, lines 33-67).

As per claims 13 - 18, claims 13- 18 are system claims of method claims 1-2, 4-5, and 11. They do not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claims 1-2, 4, 5, 11, and 1, respectively. Therefore, claims 13-18 are rejected under same scope as recited in claims 1- 2, 4, 5, 11 and 1, supra.

As per claim 19, Maes discloses a mobile terminal [see Figure 19] wirelessly coupled to a network, comprising: a transceiver [transmitter, column 23, lines 31-36] configured to facilitate exchange of data with a locator arrangement via the network; a memory [memory] capable of storing at least one of a mobile services transport module and a Web services processing module [see column 13, lines 36-62]; and a processor coupled [processor, column 6, lines 10-15] to the memory and the transceiver, the processor configured by the mobile services transport module to receive Web service messages [see column

26, lines 33-67] targeted for the mobile terminal via the locator arrangement using a mobile services transport protocol and communicate the Web service messages [see column 28, line 29 – column 29, line 2] to the Web services processing module, the processor configured by the Web services processing module to process the Web service messages.

However, Maes is silent about the mobile terminal as not being an internet addressable.

Kumar teaches that mobile terminal is not Internet addressable (see column2, line 60 - column 3 line 47)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Kumar and Maes to provide a secure and enhanced communication between mobile terminals, terminal devices that are not internet addressable and to provide communication to the terminals that are outside the current local area network located remotely on second network or behind the private network gateway device.

As per claims 20-22, claims 20-22 do not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claims 2, 4, and 5. Therefore, claims 14-17 are rejected under same scope as recited in claims 2, 4, and 5, supra.

As per claims 23-27, claims 23- 27 are computer readable medium claims of method claims 1-2, 4-5 and 11. They do not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claims 1-2, 4- 5, and 11. Therefore, claims 23-27 are rejected under same scope as recited in claims1-2, 4-5, and 11, supra.



As per claims 28-33, claims 28-33 are server computer claim of method claims 1-2, 4-5, 11, 13 and 18. They do not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claims 1-2, 4-5, 11, 13 and 18. Therefore, claims 28-33 are rejected under same scope as recited in claims 1-2, 4-5, 11, 13 and 18, supra.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See accompanying PTO 892 form.
6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAKET K. DAFTUAR whose telephone number is (571)272-8363. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-W.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. K. D./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2151  
/John Follansbee/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151